

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

LIBRARY
APR 20 1954
DETROIT

VOL. XIV, No. 6

APRIL 19, 1954

\$2.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Easter After Good Friday

"The three sad days are quickly sped.
He rises glorious from the dead."

EASTER follows Good Friday very swiftly. "The three sad days" indeed are very "quickly sped." Perhaps we wonder about the three sad days, which and when they are? Good Friday, although a very long day, if observed meditatively or liturgically, is still after all only one day. Even if we count Easter Eve in our reckoning, that only makes two days;—and then, Easter Day is here. Alleluia; He is Risen.

"O Felix Culpa," (O—happy transgression) cried St. Augustine, catching and holding together the mystery of our sin and our redemption. "O Felix Culpa," we echo at Easter-tide, and accept with grateful hearts the gift of God's way of reckoning; for, because of that, indeed we may describe our sin as happy, our transgression as fortunate. The drama has been brought to a marvellous conclusion—the Hero was both tragic and triumphant. Our hearts have been wrung; we have shed our tears; but in the last act there were several charming short scenes showing the slain Hero quite realistically alive. It was rather pleasant to have our tension relaxed in this way, and it was both more effective and less obvious than having to wait for the final curtain call to show us that the dramatae personae are still alive and well.

"O Felix Culpa"; we might echo that cry even in a yet more comfortable way. If we have shared at all in the experience of Lent and Holy Week, surely we have caught a little of the meaning of sin and alienation, sorrow and frustration. We know we have erred and strayed; all of us are prodigal sons; all of us unprofitable servants. But now our debts are paid for; our trespasses are overlooked; our sin is covered; "O Felix Culpa"—"Let us keep the Feast . . . Amen, Alleluia." Do we in our fervent Amens and with our loud Alleluias perhaps too easily appropriate the felicity—the happiness? Transposing St. Augustine's words, is our easy felicity rather culpable, even actually an offense?

Our gratitude expressed fortissimo in festival services, does it come too suddenly and too cheaply, rather in the same manner in which the word "gladness" in Easter hymns so glibly follows and so conveniently rhymes with—"sadness"?

These and many other questions abide, both for the Christian disciple and for the church—at Easter-time. Every year, we turn to the events of the Passion and Resurrection and seek to understand the real meaning of the drama as it proceeds. The first and last question asked both by the individual Christian and the corporate body of believers is the question of participation, "Lord is it I?"—This was the question asked at the Last Supper, but it is the question asked by every disciple as by the Church—collectively. We share in the events; we are Judas; we are Peter; and we should be Simon of Cyrene; we should be the faithful women—watching the Passion and witnessing the Resurrection.

We are ready to appropriate the felicity all right, but do we share the suffering? The churches are full for Easter Services, but not for Passion Sunday or even for Palm Sunday. In the New Testament, the fickle crowds throng the stage on Palm Sunday and during the events which lead to Calvary, but after that—they disappear; the crowds are not there on the first Easter Morn. With us, it is the other way round. The crowds turn up for the cheerful last act of the drama. But the record attendance for Easter Day forces the question. Can we short-circuit the story of the Passion in this way? Is it all right to let the crowds join in just at the last to sing "Welcome—happy morning"?

There is also another level to this question which Good Friday and Easter Day force upon us. The Church is the Body of Christ; but it is the human suffering Body of Christ in the world, not the Heavenly Body—which is Risen, Ascended, Glorified. This New Testament description of the Church is rather hard to fit in with the great ecclesiastical organizations we know today. These great institutions, as we are so often informed in press releases and pro-

motional statements, are really going concerns in every sense of the word.

Perhaps at Easter-time the Church should remember that it can claim to be the Body of Christ only if it witness to and share in the experiences of Christ in the world. This means that if it wish to live with Christ, it first has to be buried with Him. St. Thomas Aquinas, quoting St. Hilary, reminds us that "under the representation of the linen cloth the Church is buried together with him." Also, should not we of the Church, of the Body of Christ, recall the fact that the human flesh of Christ found its only resting place in the Tomb? "It is the last mystery of the Passion and the Redemption. Jesus Christ had nowhere to rest on earth except in the sepulchre." (Pascal)

It is hard for the parish clergyman, as for the Church generally, either to re-live or show forth to the flock this experience of being "buried" or "in the tomb." The parish minister has to be the scene-shifter for the last act of the Drama. In the parish church, Easter Eve, instead of being one of the three sad days, is an extremely busy day of preparation. The floral effects arrive; and the women of the church and their helpers are hard at work all day. The choir has to work in a last rehearsal, and everyone is very busy getting ready for the record attendance of the next day. The symbols of the Passion and of Good Friday disappear—almost too easily. The Cross—no longer veiled instead is swamped by the magnificent display of flowers. The music—particularly with the new organ, is going to be very loud and cheerful—"Welcome—happy morning." O Felix Culpa, O Felicissima Culpa; forte fortissimo.

Yet, as we sing our songs of praise, certain words from the New Testament abide with us. "*Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?*"—The words of our Lord give the point to St. Paul's further question: "*Do you know that all of us who have been baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?*"

Grant, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, so that by daily dying unto self, we may be buried with him; and that through the grave, and gate of death, we may pass to our joyful resurrection; for his merits, who died and was buried and rose again for us, the same thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

Collect for Easter Even. B. C. P. (Adapted)

URSULA M. NIEBUHR.

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE atomic age has given way to the hydrogen era. The first hydrogen bomb was exploded on November 17, 1952. But we were not fully conscious of the import of this explosion until two more bombs were detonated in March, 1954. Perhaps that was because the pictures of the first event were not released until the March experiments. We need not only the reality, but some help to the imagination in comprehending the reality. There is no difficulty any more in visualizing the awful power of the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. We now know that it is 600 times as destructive as the first bomb exploded over Hiroshima. Even if Americans may be still inclined to complacency in the face of these awful developments, our friends and allies, not to speak of our enemies, are thoroughly aroused. Anti-American sentiment has reached new heights in Asia chiefly because some ashes from the bomb injured Japanese fishermen. The prime minister of India has lectured us. The opposition party in England has pressed the prime minister to ask us for a conference on our intentions in regard to the bomb. These reactions in sum total clearly mean that we do not cut an imposing picture to our friends, or let us say, friendly critics, with this fearsome lethal instrument in our hands. It may be, as Churchill has assured the British opposition, the best deterrent of war, but it has certainly militated against our moral prestige in the world.

The public reactions in America have been, by contrast, rather disturbingly complacent. But a rather hysterical reaction, in the *New York Times* by the noted critic and author Lewis Mumford, is indicative of the undertones of moral perplexity in the mood of our nation. Mr. Mumford declares: "... let us cease further experiments, lest our self-induced fears further upset our mental balance . . . let us canvass new lines of approach to the problem of power and peace." Mr. Mumford reveals the measure of his own confusion by the suggestion that "there are many alternative policies to the policy to which we have committed ourselves practically without debate. The worst of all these alternatives, the policy of submission to communism would still be far wiser than the destruction of civilization."

Mr. Mumford does not really understand that it is not possible for an individual, and even less for a nation, to choose a certain and present evil in preference to what is imagined to be a worse future one. We can not escape the dilemma which we confront by the fact that the threat of atomic power may be a deterrent of war; but this threat also involves the risk of an atomic war and the consequent destruc-

tion. The fact that our generation should face this dilemma in an age which thought of man so simply as the potential master of his historical destiny is perhaps as critical for our spiritual life as the threat of atomic destruction.

The way out suggested by Mr. Mumford is not possible for us. But we might well be reminded that our predicament compels caution and requires a rejection of all hysterical solutions. It is unfortunate that we should have proposed a policy of "massive retaliation" just in advance of the revelation of these dread developments in the field of atomic weapons, for the policy of "massive retaliation" suggests to the world that we might use atomic weapons first. Yet our only hope is that the dread of the consequences will prevent any nation from using these weapons first. Perhaps it is the combination of these two factors: the threat of using the weapons first and the revelation of the bomb's awful destructive power which have lowered our moral prestige in the world so catastrophically. With such a terrible weapon in our hands it is not only necessary that the nerves governing the trigger finger should be steady but that we give the appearance, as well as

the reality, of steadiness to the world.

The case of Professor John A. Hutchison of Williams College before the Velde congressional committee allows us to see the catastrophic consequences of the anti-communist mania which has enveloped our nation. Professor Hutchison has been a consistent anti-communist whose political attitudes and opinions have been models of wisdom and integrity. He did belong for three years, in the period of 1935-38, to the "League against War and Fascism." He left the organization when he became persuaded that it was communist controlled. No one has accused him of belonging to the communist party. But the committee claims to have sworn testimony that he attended communist meetings which he denies. Even if his memory should have been faulty on this point, and even if he had been a party member, this whole uproar with the open threats of possible perjury proceedings would be fantastic. These are the preoccupations of our hysterical anti-communists in our tragic age. Professor Hutchison has become a victim of a capricious justice without a sense of proportion. The nation itself is also a victim of this mania.

R. N.

Evangelism at Evanston

THEODORE O. WEDEL

IT seems safe to say that among the six subsidiary themes on the agenda for the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches the one which will attract the least attention on the part of the press or the novelty seeking visitor will be Evangelism. The very word is shop-worn, and concern for the cause is burdened with weariness. Every one, of course, is *for* evangelism. The promotional secretariats of the churches, with their calls to membership drives and for increased support for missions, have seen to that. Evangelism, accordingly, has come to be thought of as a promotional technique which can be handed over to specialists who ought, to be sure, to confer with one another to compare methods and to subject their pride of statistics to a little humbling realism. But just what can an ecumenical assembly, very few of whose members are either evangelists or missionaries, do with the subject except, possibly, to urge the churches and their evangelistic experts to do "more of the same"? Some veterans of ecumenical gatherings are bold enough to assert that no conference which has thus far been part of our ecumenical history has succeeded in saying anything of great significance regarding evangelism.

Can Evanston reverse this trend toward lethargy and unconcern? Those responsible for the preparatory literature for the Second Assembly are cautiously hopeful. Something apparently has happened during the past half decade to reveal to thoughtful

church leaders that the pathway to unity among churches may only be achieved by way of a common witness to the world. Missions and evangelism and unity cannot be divorced from one another. The homeland of the older churches has become as much a mission field as the lands of the younger churches; it may be of considerable significance that representatives of the International Missionary Council and of the younger churches participated in the work of the Commission on Evangelism of the World Council Study Department this past summer. This collaboration between the two still autonomous major ecumenical "Councils" in at least one shared concern may be prophetic of further unification.

When the cause of unity and that of evangelism and missions are seen to be vitally interrelated, it is no longer possible to hand over evangelism to a department of ecclesiastical technology and to leave it there. Few ecumenical pamphlets which have circulated among the churches in these years between the two Assemblies has received more attention than *The Calling of the Church to Mission and Unity*. This "Call" does not mince words. "We have to confess," so it reads, "that the normal life of our churches does *not* express the truth that to be a Christian is necessarily to be involved in a mission to the whole world. The average congregation is apt to be an introverted community which does not think primarily of its obligation to bring the knowledge of

Christ to its whole neighborhood and to the whole world."

Let any one interested in arousing a discussion on evangelism accuse a typical congregation of being an "introverted community" (or, in the vivid phrase current on the European continent, of being a "bourgeois ghetto") and he may be surprised how the topic comes to life! The entire membership of the church is called to self-examination. Theological questionings are evoked: What is the Church—a sectarian company of the saved, separated *out of* the world and therefore responsible only for their own purity and moral culture, or a people of God elected for a mission to the world, called to risk their very lives in witnessing to God's love in Christ for all mankind? Has evangelism fulfilled its task when it concentrates its efforts upon bringing prospective converts "to Christ," or even upon incorporating them into the life of a church—when, in other words, is it church membership aggrandizement? Or is such evangelism, proper in its place, no doubt, only a beginning or even secondary to a much more comprehensive evangelizing vocation? What is this "church" into which the convert is being baptized or received? It might conceivably be a new Laodicea which God is spewing out of His mouth, and incorporating new members might endanger their salvation. One report from the field states that "the spiritual poverty and unpreparedness of the Church is such that no one can desire a large number of those now outside to enter the churches as they now are."

If the literature in preparation for the Evanston Assembly does nothing more than to arouse the churches to a confrontation with such theological issues, it may lead to momentous results. Evangelism has suffered far too long from theological anemia. And while our European brethren are only too ready to divert attention from methods and techniques (often labeled American and therefore suspect) and to concentrate upon biblical exegesis, there can be little doubt that here is an area of ecumenical concern which needs theological clarification. A defense of American activism, to be sure, deserves its day in court also. "We Americans," to quote Dr. Homrighausen's reply to Bishop Berggrav (*The Christian Century*, October 7, 1953) "are not willing to be *theologians* of the gospel merely." The "theologian-pastor" quiescent in his study, typical of at least some European clerical life, could profit from a visit to our shores.

Yet, on the ecumenical area as a whole, theological questioning of current evangelism is at the moment rightly uppermost. Is the Church itself the goal of the evangelizing task, or is the Church a means to an end? The proper reply is, we may grant, both at once. But the Church is in constant danger of forgetting that it lives between the times,

that the Church's eschatological Sabbath Day is not yet, and that the churches will one day stand before their Judge to answer for their stewardship of grace. The grace of God's outgoing love for the world is clearly not a monopoly of a few elect who remain safely indoors. A New Testament text which loomed large in the Commission's wrestling with the theology of evangelism is Hebrews 3:1, which speaks of Christ as "*the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.*" Apostolic means "on a mission" and "being sent." The Church, which is Christ's Body, must participate in this apostolic ministry or prove apostate, and this ministry is missions and evangelism. A man on a mission is not safely at home. There may have been times when martyrdom or retreat into the catacombs was the sole witness possible. But when persecution is not calling such a halt, retreat into self-culture (one could place under at least some judgment, for example, the millions being spent in America on cushioned parish parlors and aluminum kitchens) cannot find excuse. A German comment on the temptation to introversion is worth quoting: "Our miserable ghetto-existence is too often identified with a confessing Church in the catacombs, *ejected by society.*"

Evangelism, thus seen in the light of the Church's apostolic mission, involves the total impact of a Christian community upon its total environment. The Church must free itself from bondage to visible results and statistical success stories. God "*maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good*" (Matt. 5:45). The Church, as in and with Christ the Light of the world, must do the same. On the mission field this may mean the patient evangelization of an entire village in place of a premature harvest of a few isolated converts. At home it means confronting a whole industrial community or university center, with no loss of faith if such witness yields no immediate church membership results. There are those who suggest that we ought to drop the word evangelism altogether and employ instead the word "engagement." The latter term does deserve attention. Its meaning cannot be so easily confused with promotion of a church's internal comfort.

Christ's love for the world must become the motive of the members of a Christian parish or congregation to identify themselves with society outside church walls, to listen as well as to speak, to say "Yes" to what remains of true light in the search for God in non-Christian faiths, even those of secularism and Marxism, before they say the awesome "No" of the Gospel. Mere verbalism can, in any event, no longer be trusted as a sufficient witness. Workers, for example, who, in many parts of the world, constitute the class most alienated from the Church, do not differentiate easily between faith and works.

In all this evangelizing ministry, the laity are highlighted. It is, in fact, significant that the phrase "the

Apostolate of the Laity" has domesticated itself in recent literature on evangelism. It connotes a view of lay religion which thrusts the layman, with all the possible risks involved, boldly out into the world. He is to witness to the Gospel where he is in his secular calling. Neither the internal life of the churches, nor the specific vocation of "the ministry" will suffer. Where else will the layman receive the renewal of power of the Holy Spirit needed for his evangelizing except as a loyal member of the Body of Christ with its nourishing Word and Sacraments?

To make concrete this central concern of those who, in many parts of the world are voicing hopes for a new day in evangelism, the present writer, in a report for the Commission to the Study Department Committee, ventured to employ an analogy. Picture a coastguard or life-saving station on a dangerous coast. It has stood for centuries, and tales of its rescue service are treasured by the successors of the founders. In the course of time, indeed, those who manned the rescue service turned to expanding and beautifying the station itself. Do not "life-savers" deserve comfort and a rest home to fit them for their arduous task? Architects vied with one another in building for them a dwelling place worthy of their vocation. Honorary though not active members joined in lending support. Nor was the rescue station designed merely for those whose duty it was to launch the life-boats. The rescued in their turn deserved warm beds and proper food.

This station-building, however, became in time such an absorbing activity that rescue service itself was increasingly neglected, although traditional rescue drills and rituals were carefully preserved. The actual launching out into ocean storms became a hireling vocation or one left to a few volunteers. What was even more a deflection of the original charter of the station, when the dedicated volunteers brought in their boatloads of the shipwrecked—men of alien color and speech, maimed and encrusted with ocean slime—the custodians of the rescue station were disconcerted and disturbed. "Will they not," so they were tempted to exclaim, "soil the linen on our clean beds, and, moved by gratitude for salvation, desire to become life savers themselves and thus presume to belong by right to our intimate fellowship? Should we not set up a minimum entrance requirement of cleanliness and good manners before we offer shelter? We can, at least, urge them to build a life saving station of their own at a decorous distance from our own."

The analogy requires many corrective footnotes, no doubt. We meet in all this wrestling with the meaning of evangelism the paradox of the Church as eschatological reality, already rejoicing in life in the Spirit whereby believers "are sealed unto the day of redemption" and even now "sealed together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Ephesians 4:30,6),

and the Church thrust out into the world, apostolic messenger of good news to all mankind and not concerned for her own safety or secular prosperity.

The Survey of evangelism around the world which will be one of the basic documents in the hands of delegates to Evanston illustrates the latter insight into the nature of the Church by way of a series of pioneering experiments. Traditional "mass-evangelism" is not condemned, but is, with some severity, robbed of its claim of dominance or monopoly, as if evangelism meant this and little more. The Survey will describe such newer evangelizing ventures as an "open rectory" in a city slum, chaplaincies to factories, a service which may for years show no results in increased church attendance, and the challenge of what has come to be called the "para-church" or "half-way church." By the latter phrase is meant a group of inquirers or even of those far from commitment who are willing to expose themselves to an encounter with the Christian faith. Such a structuring of the Church's evangelizing vocation has implications which may disturb self-centered parochialisms. It may involve a rethinking of what we mean by the word "parish," since the contemporary secular communities which the Church is called to evangelize increasingly consist of vocational groupings in place of the traditional geographical neighborhood.

In all this groping for new light, one insight appears clearly to be gaining ground. The idolatry of the introverted church must submit to judgment. But an evangelism aimed at converting the individual abstracted from his communal environment is seen to be equally wrong. The appeal to "decide for Christ," which climaxed traditional revivalist preaching, may result in nothing more than a frail subjective experience. The ultimate evangelizing agency must be a community of faith and power;—Alcoholics Anonymous is one striking illustration of a group thus mediating salvation. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*

Are we then, by way of a circular argument, back to the Church again? Yes, but it must be the Church under judgment, the Church with doors opened to the world. Evangelism begins at home. Nothing short of a corporate re-presentation of the Gospel to and in the world will suffice. To think of this as a vocational specialty which can be handed over to a hierarchical caste of "evangelists" or missionaries is corporate apostasy.

The "Christian News Letter" for March, 1946, contained an account of a conference on evangelism held at Cambridge, England, presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The most vigorous appeal for reorienting our conceptions of evangelism for our time was voiced by George McLeod, founder of the Iona Community and a notable pioneer in what is coming to be known as "community evangelism." He puts into words a plea for a new

strategy—one in which scores of other pioneers in evangelism would be willing to join. Two paragraphs from his address, in shortened form, will be quoted here. They follow a discussion of the incomprehension of modern men and women when the message of salvation is presented merely in classical theological terms.

"The Gospel currently preached does not waken an answering chord in their experience. It looks to them much as some mediaeval treatise in demonology looks to us. It is a disastrous mistake to suppose that what is chiefly wanted for more successful evangelism is improvements in methods and the use of new techniques. It is the whole classical exposition of the Gospel that needs to be re-examined. When Christendom existed, the Church had a limited function within society in which Christian standards, even if not observed in practice, were generally acknowledged as binding. The Church was organically connected with every other part of the body politic; new life in the heart could quickly flow through the whole. All that is now gone. If the Christian message is to have meaning in the conditions of today, it is necessary to offer men a more recognizable community life. Christians must become more material, more matter of fact, more incarnational, before we

can look for spiritual revival.

"This means that the traditional order in presenting the Gospel needs to be reversed. The prevailing practice is to start from God the Creator, tell men of the redemptive work of Christ, and lead them by this path into the experience of the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. But since the content of our message has ceased to have any meaning for them, the only thing to be done is to begin at the other end by showing them community in actual operation. Something new must enter their experience before they can understand the Christian message."

Evangelism—to attempt another formulation of this same insight—needs as agent the dynamism of a community of power, actually living the new life "in Christ." We are recapitulating apostolic times. "*We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places*" (Ephesians 6:12). Gigantic spirit-bearing social structures, with rival promises of salvation, confront the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit. The days of the "single-combat" evangelist, or of trust in mere verbal proclamation of the Gospel, may be over. The "*whole armor of God*" is the reconverted Church herself.

CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

Paris Dispatch: The Church and the Machine*

The French also are in the throes of a great political debate on a national scale about the merits and drawbacks of an unusual method of fighting Communism on the home front. It involves the continuation of the missionary activity of the so-called worker-priests, regularly ordained Roman Catholic clergymen, who try to "re-Christianize" the largely Communist-dominated working-class people of French industrial cities. Steps taken recently to bring this activity to a virtual halt and to silence some of its defenders have thrown French Catholicism into what Cardinal Feltin of Paris calls a "grave crisis." And since France is a Catholic country, at least to the extent that nearly 90 percent of the population profess no other religion, and with lines between doctrinal and political matters tending to blur, this means an agitation in public opinion generally, almost as serious as the one in the U. S. about McCarthyism.

The experimental missionary apostolate of the worker-priests is 10 years old. It began with a book, as do many things in a country in which literature and life interpenetrate, often to the benefit of neither. After reading Abbe Godin's *France, Pays de Mission?* the late Cardinal Suhard approved an effort to remove the "wall which separates the Church from the masses." At the seminary at Lisieux (which has now been closed) of the Mission de France, 350 priests were trained as domestic missionaries to "the most de-Christianized regions";

and since the word region was intended socially as well as geographically, some of these priests were workers.

But the Mission de Paris (and similar undertakings in Bordeaux, Lyons, Marseilles, Lille and Limoges) selected priests who had learned a trade and sent them to work full-time in factories, mines, mills and shops. They were autonomous; they lived, dressed, worked, acted (and in some cases, thought and felt) exactly as did the workers whom they tried to win back from a faith in the Marxist utopia.

Until the death of Cardinal Suhard in 1949, the worker-priests had a guide and a protector. In the spirit of Pope Pius XI who had said that "The workers will be evangelized by the workers," he sponsored an effort to prove to the workers, who were being subjected to more and more Communist propaganda, that the Church was not only *for* them but also *with* them.

The defense of the worker-priests in those years—and now, at a time when their apostolate is threatened with extinction—comes from those Frenchmen, both outside and inside the Church (and including prelates on the very highest levels of the hierarchy), who believe that the French social system, still both traditionalist and based on class war, has become subject to Communism's internal siege largely because its leaders have been—and are—more unwilling than unable to face adjustment to modern conditions. Although Cardinal Suhard was not a modernist, the worker-priest experiment which he sponsored provided leadership to modernization.

The issue now, says the *London Sunday Times*, "involves the relationship between the Church and the mod-

* This article first appeared in the April 5, 1954, issue of the *New Republic*. We reprint it in full.

ern world." The question, says the *London Observer*, is, "Can the methods of the Roman Church be effectively adapted to the political and social exigencies of modern France?"

But there is another question—and it was on the basis of a negative answer that the Vatican acted to halt the experiment. Can priests—or anyone, for that matter—fight Communism on its own ground, and with its own weapons, without being tainted, corrupted or entirely won over by its evils, and hence help in the spread of that evil? There is no doubt that a number of the worker-priests (of whom there have never been more than about 100) did in fact succumb.

The first overt sign was the arrest of two of the worker-priests during the demonstration in Paris on May 28, 1952, against the arrival of General Ridgway as the successor to General Eisenhower at SHAPE. In April, 1953, 16 of the worker-priests wrote to the Communist newspaper *Humanité*, attacking the head of the Christian Workers' Union. There were other signs too that the splendid ship launched by Cardinal Suhard was losing its rudder.

Since last autumn there have been comings and goings between Paris and Rome of Cardinals and high Church officials, and a steady series of limitations on the activities of the worker-priests, accompanied by mounting passion in the great debate. Two days after Christmas, seven Jesuits who were worker-priests were ordered to stop their proselytizing work, and obeyed. In January, the bishops with worker-priests in their diocese called upon them to give up all of their temporal charges and to reduce their daily work in factories to three hours a day.

The effect was a letter of bitter protest signed by 73 of the worker-priests and one signed by 200 militant Catholic workers. In February, the most serious sanction of all was imposed. The Master General of the Dominican Order came from Rome to Paris and removed from their posts seven of the leading Dominicans in France, the Provincials of Paris, Lyons and Toulouse, and four theologians, writers and editors. Fathers Boisselot, Chenu, Congar and Feret, outstanding leaders in French intellectual life, were punished for having supported the worker-priests; the Provincials (holders of the office of head of a Province of the Order, and chosen by election) were dismissed for having failed to discipline the others.

This drastic and dramatic action, the most serious taken since the Royalist *Action Française* was put on the Index and its leaders excommunicated nearly a generation ago, brought such leading Catholic laymen as François Mauriac the Nobel Prize novelist, into print with vigorous protests. As might have been expected, rumors—entirely unsubstantiated, undoubtedly false and spread by the Communists—were put into circulation to the effect that the Vatican had yielded to McCarthyish pressure from the Catholic hierarchy in the U. S. If any influences were brought to bear—and there is nothing more than supposition to support the notion—it is likely that they came from Spain, West Germany and, most of all, from Italy herself for fear of the spread of Catholic liberalism.

Paris

FRANK GORRELL.

Ecumenical Team Sponsored by N.C.C. Will Visit U. S. Cities in Autumn

(EPS)—An ecumenical team of five persons, all of whom will have been delegates to the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, will visit twelve American cities during late September and October, under the auspices of the National Council of Churches. Those who will participate in the speaking tour, which will emphasize the National Council's two-year theme of "The Church's Call to Mission and Unity," are:

Rajah B. Manikam, who since 1951 has been serving as a "roving ambassador" in East Asia for the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. As Executive Secretary of the National Christian Council of India he took a leading part in the Tambaram Conference of the International Missionary Council in 1938, and has served on deputations to the United States, Britain, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland. He was a delegate to the Amsterdam Assembly in 1948. Mrs. (Ruby) Manikam, who has been active with work among women in Asia, will accompany her husband.

Philip Potter, a Methodist minister at Cap Haitien, Haiti, Chairman of the World Council of Churches of Youth Department. He has been Secretary of the Student Christian Movement in Jamaica; delegate to the World Conference of Christian Youth at Oslo, Norway; and to the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council. In 1953 Mr. Potter spent two months visiting West Africa for the Youth Department of the World Council of Churches and the World Council of Christian Education.

Mrs. James D. Wyker, President of the National Council's General Department of United Church Women, an ordained minister of the Disciples of Christ, and the wife of a minister. She was selected recently as one of the six Protestant church women exerting the greatest influence in American church life. She represented her communion at the Amsterdam Assembly.

Bishop Ellis Gideon Gulin, Bishop of Tampere, of Finland. He is especially interested in projects of social welfare, and in developing a technique for missions in industrial plants in Helsinki and elsewhere. He visited the United States in 1950 under the auspices of the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A., and has been active in the World Student Christian Federation.

Charles P. Taft, lawyer and labor consultant, Chairman of the Department of Church and Economic Life of the N.C.C. In 1948 he served as President of the Federal Council of Churches. As a member of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, he was instrumental in the establishment of the World Council and now serves on its Central and Executive Committees. From 1937 to 1939 he served as chairman of the National Committee for Community Mobilization for Human Needs.

The Team will spend from two to three days in each of twelve cities where they will have opportunity to address groups of ministers, church women, young people, laymen. There will also be large public meetings in many of the cities, appearances on radio and TV and other speaking appointments.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT
Co-Chairmen

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN	WILLIAM SCARLETT
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
AMOS N. WILDER	

MARION HAUSNER, *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

Correspondence

APR 24 1954

Dear Sir:

A word about your short editorial note on Travancore-Cochin (S. India). The Socialist Party which is numerically weaker than either congress or communists in the legislature, has formed the government all alone be-

cause neither the congress nor the communists have a majority to form one, and the socialists have refused to join a coalition. To complete the picture, however, one should add that the Congress (Nehru's party) in Travancore has declared its unconditional support to the socialist minority government. This makes the situation less precarious than your editorial seems to indicate.

By the way, has the editor nothing more positive to say about Nehru's foreign policy than that it represents "a confused neutralism"? One begins to despair of the direction the more enlightened Christians in this country are taking in this age of A-bombs and H-bombs. I am not a pacifist, but when the more responsible non-pacifists surrender more and more to the idea of giving up all limits in the name of military necessity and international responsibility, one feels persuaded that even a confused neutralism may have some positive value, both as a protest against a confused militarism even when termed Christian, and as a force for peace in the world.

M. M. THOMAS

New York, New York

We are glad to have this word from Mr. Thomas about the close cooperation between the Congress Party and the socialists in Travancore. It is to be hoped that this will frustrate all efforts of the communists to gain control.

There is "confused neutralism" in Nehru's foreign policy. In so far as this means that he refuses to be in any way a satellite of the west, this is good. In so far as it grows out of real illusions about communist power or intentions, it has danger in it. If it were not for what seem to be illusions about communist power or intentions, all that is true in Nehru's criticisms of our policy would be far more persuasive than it is. Mr. Thomas' call for criticism of the tendency in this country to exaggerate the military approach to the problem of communism and of a reckless mentality that may come from possession of the H-bomb is very much in order. There are real confusions in our foreign policy. We have thought that in this journal we have continually represented the same corrective for which Mr. Thomas calls. His letter, coming as it does from a person whose judgment we deeply respect, indicates how far we can become separated in conviction today when we see the world from the standpoint of different historical situations.

J. C. B.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving Dept.
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-54

Authors In This Issue

Ursula M. Niebuhr (Mrs. Reinhold) is Associate Professor of Religion at Barnard College, Columbia University, and Executive Officer of the Department of Religion.

The Rev. Theodore O. Wedel is Warden of Washington Cathedral College of Preachers in Washington, D. C., and a member of the Commission on Evangelism of the Evanston Assembly. His article is the second in a series on the Evanston Assembly.